

REMARKS

Claims 1-55 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-55 stand rejected.

Claims **1, 3-7, 11, 12, 19, 21-24, 26, 27, 34, 38, 39, 41, and 43-49** have been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally-filed application, and at least at paragraphs [0006], [0036], [0037], [0047]-[0055] and Figures 3 and 8.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 16, 19, 20, 24, 25, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0223402 (“Sanchez”) in view of Choe, U.S. Publication No. 2002/0118682 (“Choe”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Without conceding to the validity of the rejection, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 19, 34, and 41 to recite features that are not taught or fairly suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, the amended claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

For example, the cited sections of Sanchez and Choe, alone or in permissible combination, fail to teach the claimed act of accessing the subset of the second lookup table based on a second portion of the packet header, where the second portion of the packet header comprises at least a second part of the multicast group destination address. As acknowledged by the Office Action on page 6, Sanchez fails to teach the claimed accessing a portion (or subset, as amended) of the second lookup table based on a second portion of the packet header, where the first lookup table identifies a portion (or subset, as amended) of the second lookup table. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited sections of Choe fail to remedy this lack of disclosure.

As known in the art, the destination address of a packet indicates the destination of the packet. If the packet is a unicast packet (and thus the destination address is a unicast destination address), the unicast destination address indicates a network destination (such as a network device in the network) as the packet’s destination. A

unicast network destination can be reached by a route, or path through the network. Information about the route to the network destination is stored in a routing table, and is identified by the network prefix of the network destination's destination address.

Applicants note that unicast routing (or unicast forwarding of packets) is described by Choe. Choe's destination IP address comprises a network prefix. Choe [0010]. Choe's destination IP address is compared to network prefixes stored in Choe's skip list and hash tables in order to find a route entry. Choe [0020], [0074]-[0081]. Once a route entry is found, the packet is output on the interface associated with the route entry. Choe [0010], [0044], [0019], [0050]. Thus, Choe's skip list is used to perform unicast routing (or unicast forwarding) of a packet, where Choe's destination IP address of the packet is a unicast destination IP address. While Choe refers to maintaining "routing/forwarding tables," Figures 3 and 4 indicate that both Choe's routing table and forwarding table are disclosed to store prefixes, which are used in Choe's unicast routing/forwarding. Thus, whether described as a routing table or a forwarding table, Choe's skip list is used to perform unicast routing/forwarding, where Choe's skip list and hash tables are accessed using a unicast destination IP address.

Since Choe's system only describes accessing Choe's skip list and hash tables using a unicast destination address, Choe fails to teach the claimed act of accessing a first lookup table based on a first portion of a packet header that comprises least a first part of a multicast destination address. Similarly, Choe's system fails to teach the amended claimed act of accessing a subset of a second lookup table based on a second portion of the packet header that comprises at least a second part of the multicast destination address.

Applicants also note that the claimed multicast destination address is clarified to be a multicast group destination address. Choe's skip list uses a destination IP address that comprises a network prefix, which identifies a network destination. By contrast, the claimed multicast group destination address identifies a multicast group. Thus, Choe's unicast destination IP address comprising a network prefix of a network destination fails to teach the claimed multicast group destination address, as amended.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinguishable over the cited sections of Sanchez and Choe, alone or in permissible combination. For similar reasons, independent Claims 19, 34 and 41 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 19, 34 and 41, and all claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to these claims and an indication of the allowability of same.

Claims 3-5, 17, 18, 21-23, 32, 33, 36, 43-45, 54, and 55 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez in view of Choe and further in view of Templin, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0040895 ("Templin"). Claims 8-12, 14, 15, 26, 27, 30, 31, 38, 48, 49, and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez, in view of Choe, and further in view of Arunachalam et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,466,703 ("Arunachalam"). Claims 13, 28, 29, 50, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sanchez in view of Choe in view of Arunachalam and further in view of Templin. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 1, 19, 34 and 41.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions. Applicant also hereby authorizes that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric Stephenson/

Eric Stephenson
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,321
Telephone: (512) 439-5093
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099